



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,340	12/07/2001	Takahiko Tomono	GNE464A	9470

21254 7590 03/20/2006

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

SHARMA, SUJATHA R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2684

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/005,340	TOMONO, TAKAHIKO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Sujatha Sharma	2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant (on page 12, paragraph 3) argues that the secondary reference does not teach or suggest keeping one of a telephone directory and a scheduler function operable while cutting the power off to the communication portion of the phone.

The examiner disagrees and would like to bring the applicant's attention to the LaGrotta reference. LaGrotta reference (see col. 4, lines 4-30) teaches a method where a power down signal drives the pager/communication device into a sleep mode and therefore does not monitor signal. However, the pager's clock and timing circuits are operable while in the sleep mode and the timing circuits keep track of the power down time duration of the sleep mode. Here the clock/timing circuits are used to determine activity and the amount of time is predetermined and therefore acts as a scheduler function. Also Webster's dictionary says schedule is "to appoint, assign, or designate for a fixed time". Therefore the reference is scheduling.

In view of the above arguments, the Lagrotta reference in combination with the Maruyama reference teaches the claimed feature i.e. the power supply controller stops supply of electric power to the radio section while keeping additional built-in functions other than communication function operable.

Therefore the rejection of the claims 1-20 as presented in the previous office action mailed 10/21/05 and as discussed below is considered proper.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4,7,8,11-14,17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Maruyama [JP 2000287274] in view of LaGrotta [US 6,477,361].

Regarding claims 1,11,19,20 Maruyama discloses a process for turning of portable telephone devices in prohibited areas. Maruyama further discloses a portable radiotelephone comprising:

- a radio section for receiving an input radio signal and/or transmitting an output radio signal. See paragraph 18 and 15 in Fig. 2
- a power supply controller for controlling supply of electric power to the radio section responsive to reception of a power-off signal; See 12 in Fig.2 ; the power-off signal being transmitted from a power-off signal transmitter provided in a prohibited area where use of a portable radio telephone is prohibited: See 12 in Fig.2 and paragraphs 7, 18
- a power-off signal sensor for sensing reception of the power-off signal to notify the power supply controller of reception of the power-off signal; See 12 in Fig.2 and paragraphs 7, 18

- wherein when the power-off signal sensor does not sense reception of the power-off signal, the power supply controller continues supply of electric power to the-radio section. See paragraphs 7,17,22

However, Maruyama fails to disclose a method wherein when the power-off signal sensor senses reception of the power-off signal, the power supply controller stops supply of electric power to the radio section while keeping additional built-in functions other than communication function operable.

LaGrotta, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a method wherein when the power-off signal sensor senses reception of the power-off signal, the power supply controller stops supply of electric power to the radio section while keeping additional built-in functions other than communication function operable. For example clock and calendar functions. See col. 4, lines 4-24.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of LaGrotta to Maruyama in order to stop the phone and resume normal operating conditions automatically when the user has moved out of the prohibited areas

Regarding claims 2,12 Maruyama further discloses a method wherein:

- the connection controller sends a stop signal to a relating base station to the telephone to stop a connection operation of the base station to the telephone when the power supply controller stops, the supply of electric power to the radio section; See paragraphs 7-10, 25, 27

Art Unit: 2684

- the connection controller sends a stop release signal to the relating base station to the telephone to restart the connection operation of the base station to the telephone when the power supply controller restarts the supply of electric power to the radio section. See paragraphs 7-10, 25, 27

Regarding claims 3,4,13,14 Maruyama discloses a method wherein the power-off signal sensor senses the reception of the power-off signal independent whether the radio section operates or not. See paragraph 17.

Regarding claims 5,6,15,16 Maruyama discloses a method of storing a power-off code in the non-volatile memory and if the code is present then the power supply controller keeps the power supply to the radio section stopped and if the code is not present, then the power supply controller restarts the power supply to the radio section. See english translation paragraphs 18-21 and 25-27

Regarding claims 7,17 Maruyama further discloses a method wherein the power-off release signal is transmitted from a power-off release signal transmitter in such a way that the power-off release signal sensor senses the power-off release signal when the telephone is carried out of the prohibited area. See paragraphs 15-17.

Art Unit: 2684

Regarding claims 8,18, Maruyama further discloses a method, wherein when the power-off signal is received, a fact that communication function is inoperable is displayed on a screen of a display section. See paragraphs 18,21.

Regarding claims 21-23 LaGrotta further discloses a method wherein the functions other than communications comprise at least one of a clock function (time), and a scheduler (date) function. See col. 4, lines 4-30.

3. Claims 9,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruyama [JP 2000287274] and LaGrotta [US 6,477,361] in view of Orimo [JP 4073031341].

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the modified Maruyama discloses all the limitations as claimed. However he does not disclose a method wherein the power supply to the radio section can be manually stopped or started by a specific key operation made by the user.

Orimo, in the same filed of endeavor, teaches a method wherein the radio section can be manually disabled/enabled by a specific key operation made by the user. See page 2, paragraphs 12-18.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Orimo to Maruyama and LaGrotta in order for the phone to stop and resume normal operating conditions as needed by the user.

*Conclusion*

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sujatha Sharma whose telephone number is 571-272-7886. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7.30am - 4.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2684

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sujatha Sharma  
March 15, 2006



Matthew Anderson

SPE 2618